

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 4-6, and 8-17 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, and 5 are allowed.

By this Amendment, new claim 18 has been added in order to provide a more adequate basis for protection of the invention. Also by this Amendment, claims 6, 11, 13, and 15 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Further by this Amendment, claims 8-10 and 12 have been rewritten in independent form without changing the scope of these claims. No new matter has been added. Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue broader claims and/or to appeal any or all rejections.

**Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement**

Please note that a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement, along with a PTO Form 1449, was filed on June 11, 2002 (mailed on 5/31/2002, see enclosed copy of the PTO-stamped postcard); however, a copy of this PTO Form 1449, showing that it has been initialed and signed by the Examiner, has not yet been received. Applicants respectfully request receipt of this document when it becomes available.

**Drawings**

To date, no Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review has been received. Applicants respectfully request receipt of this document when it becomes available. Please note that the original drawings filed in the patent application are "formal" drawings.

**Claim Objections**

Claims 8-10, 12, and 17 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, is noted. By this Amendment, claims 8-10

and 12 have been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 8-10 and 12 are considered to be in condition for allowance. With regard to claim 17, claim 16 from which claim 17 depends is considered to be in condition for allowance as discussed below. Thus, rewriting claim 17 in independent form would involve unnecessary expense and effort. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 8-10, 12, and 17 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection**

Claims 6 and 16 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Shimizu (U.S. Patent no. 5,754,160). Because Shimizu fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 6 as amended and claim 16, it is respectfully asserted that claims 6 and 16, respectively, patentably distinguish over Shimizu.

Specifically, with respect to amended claim 6, this claim now recites "said first display area is a simple matrix display and said second display area is an active matrix display," and with respect to claim 16, this claim recites "a display section comprising a first display and a second display stacked on said first display."

These limitations are not disclosed or suggested by Shimizu. Shimizu discloses a display panel that is divided into two adjacent display areas. Shimizu discloses that the display panel is a simple matrix panel, thus both display areas are simple matrix displays. (Shimizu, col. 4, lines 15-25 and Fig. 1). However, Shimizu is silent with regard to one of the display areas being a simple matrix and the other being an active matrix as recited in claim 6. Also, Shimizu shows adjacent displays that are coplanar, but is silent with regard to the displays being stacked. Therefore, since Shimizu fails to disclose all of the limitations of claims 6 and 16, Shimizu cannot anticipate claims 6 and 16, respectively.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Shimizu be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections**

**Claims 11, 13, 14, and 16**

Claims 11, 13, 14, and 16 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shimizu in view of Ferguson (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0075202 A1). Because the proposed combination of references does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of these claims, it is respectfully asserted that claims 11, 13, 14, and 16 are patentable over the cited references.

Specifically, with respect to claim 11, this claim as amended recites "wherein the first display is of a structurally different type from said second display." With respect to claim 13, this claim as amended recites "wherein the first display includes liquid crystal of a different type from said second display." With respect to claim 14, this claim recites "wherein said first display and said second display overlap each other." With respect to claim 16, this claim recites "a display section comprising a first display and a second display stacked on said first display."

This limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references. With regard to Shimizu, as pointed out above, this reference discloses a simple matrix display panel that is divided into two adjacent display areas. (Shimizu, col. 4, lines 15-25 and Fig. 1). However, Shimizu is silent with regard to the display areas being structurally different or including different types of liquid crystal. Also, Shimizu is silent with regard to the displays being stacked or overlapping. It is noted that the Office Action asserts that this limitation is disclosed in Shimizu at Figs. 8-11. However, it is respectfully pointed out that these figures relate to driving signals for non-overlapping, coplanar display areas, shown in Figs. 6 and 7. (Shimizu, col. 9, lines 39-53, col. 10, lines 29-30 and lines 43-56, and col. 11, lines 21-22). Therefore, contrary to the assertion in the present Office Action, Shimizu fails to teach or suggest overlapping or stacked displays.

With regard to Fergason, this reference relates to an optical system which includes a display device, such as an LCD, and optics for resizing and/or shifting the position of the output of pixels from the display device. Fergason discloses embodiments where the output of the pixels are shifted/resized so as to make the pixels appear to be overlapping. However, Fergason does not address the construct of the display device itself, but instead discloses the display device as one item in the system to which Fergason is directed. As such, Fergason is not concerned with the details of the display device, so Fergason is silent with regard to the display device having overlapping or stacked displays, having displays that are different in structure, or having displays with different types of liquid crystal.

Therefore, it follows that if one skilled in the art were to consider the combination of Shimizu and Fergason, the combination would still fail to disclose or suggest a display apparatus having displays that are different in structure as recited in claim 11, that include different liquid crystal as recited in claim 13, that overlap as recited in claim 14 or that are stacked as recited in claim 16. Since the combination of Shimizu and Fergason fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claims 11, 13, 14, and 16, the combination of Shimizu and Fergason cannot render obvious claims 11, 13, 14, and 16, respectively.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 11, 13, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shimizu in view of Fergason be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **Claim 15**

Claim 15 presently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shimizu in view of Fergason, and in further view of Dao (U.S. Patent No. 5,049,862). Because the proposed combination of references does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of this claim as amended, it is respectfully asserted that claim 15 is patentable over the cited references.

Specifically, claim 15 as amended recites "wherein said first display and said second display overlap each other."

This limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references. With respect to Shimizu and Ferguson, as discussed above, these references, alone and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a display apparatus having overlapping displays. With respect to Dao, this reference discloses a computer or computerized notebook having two displays removably hinged together. However, Dao, like Shimizu and Ferguson, fails to disclose or suggest providing a display apparatus having displays that overlap. Therefore, it follows that if one skilled in the art were to consider the combination of Shimizu, Ferguson, and Dao, the combination would still fail to disclose or suggest a display apparatus having displays that overlap as recited in claim 15. Since the combination of Shimizu, Ferguson, and Dao fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 15, the combination of Shimizu, Ferguson, and Dao cannot render obvious claim 15.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shimizu in view of Ferguson, and in further view of Dao, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **New claim**

New claim 18 has been added to provide a more adequate basis for protection of the invention. New claim 18 depends from claim 14, and is considered to patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 14.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and an early reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.


Application No. 09/537,775  
Amendment dated November 12, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2003

This Amendment increases the number of independent claims by four from seven to eleven and increases the total number of claims by one from fourteen to fifteen (20 previously paid for), but does not present any multiple dependency claims. Accordingly, a Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form authorizing the amount of \$344.00 to be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260 is enclosed herewith in duplicate. However, if the Response Transmittal and Fee Authorization form is missing, insufficient, or otherwise inadequate, or if a fee, other than the issue fee, is required during the pendency of this application, please charge such fee to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260.

If an extension of time is required to enable this document to be timely filed and there is no separate Petition for Extension of Time filed herewith, this document is to be construed as also constituting a Petition for Extension of Time Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for a period of time sufficient to enable this document to be timely filed.

Any fee required for such Petition for Extension of Time, and any other fee required by this document, other than the issue fee, and not submitted herewith, should be charged to Sidley Austin Brown & Wood LLP's Deposit Account No. 18-1260. Any refund should be credited to the same account.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Brian E. Harris  
Registration No. 48,383  
Agent for Applicants

BEH/llb:jkk:bar  
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP  
717 N. Harwood, Suite 3400  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Direct: (214) 981-3461  
Main: (214) 981-3300  
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400  
November 12, 2003